

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed June 22, 2006, has been received and reviewed. In addition, the Examiner interview summary dated July 17, 2006, summarizing an interview that occurred on July 7, 2006, has been received and reviewed.

Claims 24 through 26 and 28 through 31 are currently pending in the application. Claims 24, 25, 28 through 31 stand rejected. Claim 26 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation. Applicant proposes to cancel claims 26 and 28-30 and amend claims 24 and 31. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application with respect to the proposed amendments and analysis presented herein.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 28 through 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 28 through 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 28 through 30 have been canceled.

Objections to Claim 26/Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action summary indicated that claim 26 was objected to. However, Applicant could find no reference to claim 26 in the body of the Office Action. During an interview between the Examiner and Applicant's representative, the Examiner indicated that claim 26 was not rejected on prior art and thus contained allowable subject matter. As a result, claim 26 was

objected to as being dependent from claim 24, which was rejected on prior art. This indication of allowable subject matter is also contained in the interview summary dated July 17, 2006.

Therefore, Applicant has incorporated the allowable subject matter of claim 26 as proposed amendments to independent claim 24, from which claim 26 depended. In addition, Applicant proposes to amend claim 31, which includes all the subject matter of claim 24, in a manner similar to that of claim 24. As a result, Applicant proposes to cancel claim 26.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,175,287 to Lampen et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,321 to Caillat et al.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,287) in view of Caillat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,321). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Regarding claim 24, Applicant proposes to amend claim 24 to include the subject matter from claim 26, which was indicated as allowable. With this amendment, claim 24 is allowable and Applicant respectfully request entry of the amendment and allowance of claim 24.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,175,287 to Lampen et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,321 to Caillat et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,631, 446 to Quan

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,287) in view of Caillat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,321), and further in view of Quan (U.S. Patent No. 5,631,446). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Regarding claim 25, this claim depends from now allowable amended claim 24. Therefore, at least by virtue of its dependency from an allowable claim, and for the same reasons that claim 24 is allowable, claim 25 is now allowable. As a result, Applicant respectfully

requests that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,373,740 to Forbes et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,287 to Lampen et al., as modified by U.S. Patent No. 5,796,321 to Caillat et al.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forbes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,740) in view of Lampen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,287), as modified by Caillat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,321). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Regarding claim 31, Applicant proposes to amend claim 31 to include the subject matter from claim 26, which was indicated as allowable. With this amendment, claim 31 is allowable and Applicant respectfully request entry of the amendment and allowance of claim 31.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claims 24 and 31 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search.

CONCLUSION

Claims 24, 25, and 31 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeff M. Michelsen
Registration No. 50,978
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: August 22, 2006

JMM/sfc:tlp

Document in ProLaw